

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAURI VALJAKKA,
Plaintiff,

v.

NETFLIX, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-01490-JST

**ORDER RE: NOTICE FILED BY
ATTORNEY JOSEPH ZITO**

Re: ECF No. 288

On June 27, 2024, non-party attorney Joseph Zito filed a document entitled “Notice of Activities of Defendant’s Counsel, Rachael Lamkin.” ECF No. 288. He states that that “Netflix Attorney Rachael D. Lamkin is violating this Court’s order” at ECF No. 278 “and should be held in contempt.” The document was not filed as a motion, and for that reason alone the Court denies the requested relief. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-1.

Even were the Court to construe the document as a motion, however, the Court would still deny relief. Attorney Lamkin is not the subject of the order disqualifying Whitestone Law from representing AiPi, LLC, ECF No. 278, and therefore cannot be held in contempt of that order. *See Am. Semiconductor, Inc. v. California Assignments LLC*, No. 12-CV-06138-LHK, 2013 WL 5937968, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2013) (parties who were not parties to the action, were not named in the court’s preliminary injunction order, and were not in privity with, nor successors-in-interest to, any entity subject to the injunction, could not be held in contempt for violating its terms).

///


///

///

The Court will take no further action regarding the notice filed at docket number 288.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 3, 2024



JON S. TIGAI
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California